## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## Eastern District of Michigan

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

V. ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL **DELOIS NICHOLSON** Case Number: 06-20638 In accordance with the Bail Reform Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f), a detention hearing has been held. I conclude that the following facts require the detention of the defendant pending trial in this case. Part I—Findings of Fact (1) The defendant is charged with an offense described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1) and has been convicted of a federal offense state or local offense that would have been a federal offense if a circumstance giving rise to federal jurisdiction had existed - that is a crime of violence as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 3156(a)(4). an offense for which the maximum sentence is life imprisonment or death. an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in a felony that was committed after the defendant had been convicted of two or more prior federal offenses described in 18 U.S.C § 3142(f)(1)(A)-(C), or comparable state or local offenses. (2) The offense described in finding (1) was committed while the defendant was on release pending trial for a federal, state or local offense. (3) A period of not more than five years has elapsed since the date of conviction release of the defendant from imprisonment for the offense described in finding (1). [ (4) Findings Nos. (1), (2) and (3) establish a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of (an) other person(s) and the community. I further find that the defendant has not rebutted this presumption. Alternative Findings (A) (1) There is probable cause to believe that the defendant has committed an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in ☐ under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c). (2) The defendant has not rebutted the presumption established by finding 1 that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant as required and the safety of the community. Alternative Findings (B) (1) There is a serious risk that the defendant will not appear. (2) There is a serious risk that the defendant will endanger the safety of another person or the community. Part II—Written Statement of Reasons for Detention I find that the credible testimony and information submitted at the hearing establishes by ☐ clear and convincing evidence ☑ a preponderance of the evidence that Nicholson was arrested in the District of Arizona on the instant charges. The Magistrate Judge there granted her a bond on July 13, 2007, and she was to report to Pretrial Services a few days later. Instead, Nicholson quit her job, moved out of her home, and fled prosecution. She was a fugitive for the next 7 years until she was apprehended recently in Michigan. When caught, she stated that she did not report because she thought her case had concluded. Obviously, that was untrue, as it was just in its beginning stages

Part III-Directions Regarding Detention

when she fled. Nicholson does not live full time with her "on-again, off-again" husband, who is therefore not a viable third-party custodian. Accordingly, a preponderance of the evidence shows Nicholson to be a flight risk, such that detention is appropriate.

The defendant is committed to the custody of the Attorney General or his designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. The defendant shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private consultation with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility shall deliver the defendant to the United States marshal for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding.

September 12, 2014

Date

Signature of Judge

DAVID R. GRAND, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Name and Title of Judge

<sup>\*</sup>Insert as applicable: (a) Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. § 801 et seq.); (b) Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. § 951 et seq.); or (c) Section 1 of Act of Sept. 15, 1980 (21 U.S.C. § 955a).